

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the above amendment, the claims will be 1 to 18.

Undersigned and assignee's representatives Hirofumi Yamada and Reiko Mizutani acknowledge with appreciation the helpful interview with Examiner Moore on November 28, 2007.

As a result of said Interview, it was agreed that claims 1 to 6 patentably distinguish over the prior art as will be discussed below. Claim 2 has already been indicated as allowable.

The above amendment to claim 1 recites that the claimed compositions are capable of being crosslinked to form a pressure sensitive adhesive having a network structure.

The basis for this amendment will be seen from page 6, lines 7-11 and 28-32 of the present specification.

Further, new claims 7 to 12 recite the thermally cured composition of claims 1-6, respectively and new claims 13-18 recite an adhesive product comprising the composition of claims 1-6, respectively, thermally cured on a substrate. Support is evident from e.g. the disclosure at page 12, lines 28-33.

Claims 1, 3, 4 and 6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Inoue.

Further, claim 5 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue.

Claims 1, 3 and 6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Eckberg et al.

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The above amended claim makes it clear that the claimed composition is not only capable being crosslinked, but also capable of providing a cured product with a network structure. And this cured product is useful as a pressure sensitive adhesive, thanks to the combination of the source components (A), (B) and (C). On the contrary, neither US 5,138,009 (Inoue) nor US 5,539,013 (Eckberg) discloses such a composition.

Regarding Inoue

The Synthetic Examples 1 to 3 in Inoue which are relied on in the rejection, are performed to obtain linear compounds as shown in column 6, lines 30 (Synthetic Example 1) and

50 (Synthetic Example 2) and in column 7, line 9 (Synthetic Example 3). Therefore, all of the starting compositions of Inoue's Synthetic Examples 1 to 3 are not capable of providing a cured product with a network structure.

The rejection further notes that the reaction products in Synthetic Examples 1 to 3 are subsequently crosslinked. It appears that the rejection relies on Examples 1 to 3 in column 7 in which the synthesized compounds in the Synthetic Examples are employed as one of the starting components for the Examples. However, at least two points should be recognized:

(1) the compound with which the synthesized compounds in the Synthetic Examples are reacted has 20 hydrosilyl groups, and

(2) the synthesized compounds in the Synthetic Examples are no longer polyoxyalkylene polymers corresponding to the component (A) of the present claims, but rather organopolysiloxane- organopolyoxyalkylene block copolymers as described in Inoue.

In this regard, attention is directed to composition B-5 on page 16 and Table 1 on page 18 of the specification. Composition B-5 has 8 hydrosilyl groups on average and exhibits undesirable pressure sensitive adhesive properties. It follows that the product of the Synthetic Examples of Inoue with 20 hydrosilyl groups is even less suitable as a pressure sensitive adhesive.

Thus, the Synthetic Examples 1 to 3 of Inoue do not provide a cured product with a network structure having pressure sensitive adhesive properties.

Regarding Eckberg

The rejection relies on Example 1 in which TEGDAE (defined on the bottom of column 6) is reacted with a siloxane having terminal SiH groups in the presence of a Pt catalyst. However, similarly to the Synthetic Examples in Inoue, the compound synthesized in Example 1 is just a linear compound, but not having a network structure. Therefore, Example 1 in Eckberg is clearly distinguished from the composition as presently claimed which can provide by itself a cured product with a network structure.

For the foregoing reasons, it is apparent that the rejections on prior art are untenable and should be withdrawn.

An Information Disclosure Statement accompanies. None of the references cited therein is considered to be more relevant than those discussed above.

No further issues remaining, allowance of this application is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any comments or proposals for expediting prosecution, please contact undersigned at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

Kazuhiko UEDA et al.

By: Matthew M. Jacob

Matthew M. Jacob
Registration No. 25,154
Attorney for Applicants

MJ/aas
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
December 12, 2007